

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 RONISHA SHARDE GAINES,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
11 Defendant.

Case No. 24-cv-01280-TSH

12  
13  
14  
15 **SECOND SCREENING ORDER**  
16 **PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1915(E)**

17  
18  
19  
20 **I. INTRODUCTION**  
21  
22  
23

24 On March 15, 2024, the Court granted Plaintiff Ronisha Sharde Gaines's application to  
25 proceed in forma pauperis and screened the complaint, finding it deficient under 28 U.S.C.  
26 § 1915(e). ECF No. 5. Plaintiff has now filed a First Amended Complaint. ECF No. 11. A  
27 second amended complaint has also been filed. Sec. Amended Compl., ECF 14. Since the first  
28 amended complaint has already been replaced, the Court will address the second amended  
complaint. For the reasons stated below, the Court finds the second amended complaint is still  
deficient. No later than October 3, 2024, Plaintiff must file a third amended complaint curing the  
deficiencies identified in this screening order. If Plaintiff fails to cure these deficiencies, the case  
will be reassigned to a district judge with a recommendation for dismissal.

29  
30  
31  
32 **II. BACKGROUND**  
33  
34

35 Plaintiff was instructed in the first screening order to remedy the lack of federal subject  
36 matter jurisdiction, the failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, the  
37 immunity of some defendants, and the frivolousness of many of the allegations in the complaint.  
38

1 The Court informed the Plaintiff that individuals cannot bring claims under criminal statutes and  
2 that the State of California has immunity. The Plaintiff was also instructed to remedy the claims  
3 to ensure they are attached to a defendant. In the first amended complaint, the Plaintiff brings this  
4 case against more than 20 defendants. Amended Compl., ECF No. 11 at 6-9. Her second  
5 amended complaint is almost identical to the first. Sec. Amended Compl., ECF No. 14, at 1-4.  
6 The only change is the removal of some handwritten notes on the fifth and seventh pages of the  
7 complaint. *Id.* at 5 and 7; *see also* Amended Compl. at 5 and 7. While unclear from the  
8 pleadings, the Plaintiff appears to allege that the Attorney General and Contra Costa County have  
9 ignored her after she filed a consumer complaint because her identity was stolen. Plaintiff  
10 includes a variety of allegations, such as tax fraud, mail fraud, discrimination, harassment, identity  
11 theft, and falsified medical records. Plaintiff now seeks \$500,000 in personal injury damages for  
12 herself and her son.

### 13           **III. SUA SPONTE SCREENING UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)**

#### 14           **A. Legal Standard**

15           A court must dismiss an in forma pauperis complaint before service of process if it “(i) is  
16 frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks  
17 monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(i)-  
18 (iii). “The standard for determining whether a plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which  
19 relief can be granted under § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) is the same as the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
20 12(b)(6) standard for failure to state a claim.” *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir.  
21 2012) (citation omitted). As such, the complaint must allege facts that plausibly establish each  
22 defendant’s liability. *See Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555-57 (2007). “A claim has  
23 facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the  
24 reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*,  
25 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). In making this determination, the Court must “take as true all  
26 allegations of material fact stated in the complaint and construe them in the light most favorable to  
27 the plaintiff.” *Watison*, 668 F.3d at 1112 (citation omitted). The Court must also “construe a pro  
28 se plaintiff’s pleadings liberally and afford the petitioner the benefit of any doubt.” *Id.* (cleaned

1 up). However, the Court “may not supply essential elements of the claim that were not initially  
2 pled.” *Pena v. Gardner*, 976 F.2d 469, 471 (9th Cir. 1992).

3 A complaint must also comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, which requires the  
4 complaint to contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled  
5 to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). The failure to comply with Rule 8 is a basis for dismissal that is  
6 not dependent on whether the complaint is without merit. *McHenry v. Renne*, 84 F.3d 1172, 1179  
7 (9th Cir. 1996). Accordingly, even claims which are not on their face subject to dismissal under  
8 Rule 12(b)(6) may still be dismissed for violating Rule 8(a). *Id.*

9 **B. Application**

10 **1. Jurisdiction**

11 Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. *See Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of*  
12 *Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). As such, they “have an independent obligation to ensure that they  
13 do not exceed the scope of their jurisdiction.” *Henderson ex rel. Henderson v. Shinseki*, 562 U.S.  
14 428, 434 (2011); *Valdez v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 372 F.3d 1115, 1116 (9th Cir. 2004) (noting that  
15 courts are “obligated to consider *sua sponte* whether [they] have subject matter jurisdiction”).  
16 Federal courts are presumptively without jurisdiction over civil cases and the burden of  
17 establishing the contrary rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction. *Kokkonen*, 511 U.S. at 377.

18 There are two bases for federal subject matter jurisdiction: (1) federal question jurisdiction  
19 under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and (2) diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. A district court has  
20 federal question jurisdiction in “all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of  
21 the United States.” *Id.* at § 1331. A cause of action “arises under federal law only when the  
22 plaintiff’s well-pleaded complaint raises issues of federal law.” *Hansen v. Blue Cross of Cal.*, 891  
23 F.2d 1384, 1386 (9th Cir. 1989). A district court has diversity jurisdiction “where the matter in  
24 controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000 . . . and is between citizens of different states, or  
25 citizens of a State and citizens or subjects of a foreign state.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

26 Here, there is no diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiff has not made clear which state she resides  
27 in. Her complaint lists defendants that reside in the state of California but does not clarify which  
28 state she is a resident of or is her place of domicile. *See Mas v. Perry*, 489 F.2d 1396, 1399 (5th

1 Cir. 1974). Since it is unclear which state the Plaintiff is a resident of, the Court cannot find  
2 diversity jurisdiction.

3 However, Plaintiff alleges federal question jurisdiction under the federal RICO statute, 18  
4 U.S.C. 1961. There is a federal cause of action to enforce RICO, 18 U.S.C. 1964, and that is  
5 Plaintiff's first claim for relief, so there is federal jurisdiction over this case. Plaintiff brings an  
6 additional claim under a criminal statute for obstruction, 18 U.S.C. 73,<sup>1</sup> to assert federal question  
7 jurisdiction. As discussed in the first screening order, private individuals do not have standing to  
8 assert claims for relief through criminal statutes. *See Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619  
9 (1973). Therefore, an individual cannot file "criminal charges in the United States District Court.  
10 Rather, criminal proceedings in federal court are initiated by the government, usually through the  
11 United States Attorney's Office." *Candy-Anh-Thu: Tran v. Daniel*, 2017 WL 6513414, at \*2  
12 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2017) (citing *Harbor v. Kim*, 2017 WL 443164, at \*4 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 31,  
13 2017)). Since the Plaintiff lacks standing to bring criminal charges, claims brought under the  
14 criminal statute must be dismissed without leave to amend. *See Candy-Anh-Thu: Tran*, 2017 WL  
15 6513414, at \*2 (Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) requires that complaints alleging  
16 criminal charges must be dismissed without leave to amend). If the Plaintiff believes any  
17 defendants were involved in criminal conduct, she must contact federal law enforcement or the  
18 United States Attorney's Office and present the facts supporting that belief to them.

19 Accordingly, there is federal subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's second amended  
20 complaint.

21 **2. 18 U.S.C. §1961 (RICO)**

22 On the merits, Plaintiff's civil RICO claim is deficient. For the Plaintiff to allege a civil  
23 RICO claim, the elements of 18 U.S.C. §1964(c) must be satisfied: "(1) conduct (2) of an  
24 enterprise (3) through a pattern (4) of racketeering activity (known as 'predicate acts') (5) causing  
25 injury to the plaintiff's business or property.'" *Abcarian v. Levine*, 972 F.3d 1019, 1028 (9th Cir.  
26 2020) (quoting *Grimmett v. Brown*, 75 F.3d 506, 510 (9th Cir. 1996)). The RICO statute prohibits  
27

---

28<sup>1</sup> This is a reference to chapter 73 of title 18.

1 four kinds of activities: “(1) investing in, (2) acquiring, or (3) conducting or participating in an  
2 enterprise with income derived from a pattern of racketeering activity or collection of an unlawful  
3 debt, or (4) conspiring to commit any of the first three types of activity.” Ninth Circuit Manual of  
4 Model Civil Jury Instructions § 8 (2019); *see also* 18 U.S.C. §1962(a)-(d).

5 Plaintiff does not adequately allege the existence of an enterprise. 18 U.S.C. § 1961(4)  
6 defines an enterprise as “any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity,  
7 and any union or group of individuals associated in fact although not a legal entity.” An enterprise  
8 is proven by an “ongoing organization, formal or informal, and by evidence that the various  
9 associates function as a continuing unit.” *United States v. Turkette*, 452 U.S. 576, 583 (1981).  
10 The Plaintiff must provide factual allegations that make it plausible there was an enterprise.  
11 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555-57. These facts cannot be conclusory. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 680.

12 While the Plaintiff lists multiple bad acts by multiple Defendants, the complaint fails to  
13 provide allegations that the Defendants are functioning as a continuous unit. Plaintiff lists Kaiser  
14 Permanente, Fed-Ex, WCCUSD, Contra Costa County DA, and others as Defendants; however, no  
15 facts are provided that link the alleged conduct together under RICO. Sec. Amended Compl. at 5.  
16 Further, the conduct alleged by each Defendant does not appear to be related to one another. The  
17 falsified medical documents, discrimination, ignored Google complaint, and mail theft do not have  
18 any facts provided that make it plausible the Defendants are functioning as a continuous unit.  
19 These claims lack sufficient facts to demonstrate any organized conduct. Additionally, when the  
20 underlying wrongful conduct is listed, it is either conclusory or lacks sufficient facts to take the  
21 claim from possible to plausible. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555-57; *see also* Sec. Amended Compl. at  
22 4-6. For example, the claim against Kaiser Permanente simply lists “Falsified Medical Records,”  
23 the claim against Sylvester Greenwood states “Personal Injury,” and the claim against Meta  
24 simply says “Discrimination-Personal Injury.” Sec. Amended Compl. at 5. The facts alleged are  
25 insufficient to demonstrate a plausible enterprise. Therefore, the second element of a RICO claim  
26 is not satisfied.

27 For the third element, the Plaintiff must establish a pattern of racketeering activity. Pattern  
28 is defined as “at least two acts of racketeering activity” that occur within ten years of each other.

1 18 U.S.C. §1961(5). Two predicate acts are necessary for finding a violation, but alone may be  
2 insufficient. *See H.J., Inc. v. Nw. Bell Tel. Co.*, 492 U.S. 229, 238 (1989) (““proof of two acts of  
3 racketeering activity, without more, does not establish a pattern.””) (quoting 116 Cong. Rec.  
4 18940 (1970)). A pattern is established by a combination of continuity plus relationship. *Id.* at  
5 239 (quoting 116 Cong. Rec., at 18940); *see also Sever v. Alaska Pulp Corp.*, 978 F.2d 1529, 1535  
6 (9th Cir. 1992). For the conduct to be related, it must “embrac[e] criminal acts that have the same  
7 or similar purposes, results, participants, victims, or methods of commission, or otherwise are  
8 interrelated by distinguishing characteristics and are not isolated events.” *H.J., Inc.*, 492 U.S. at  
9 240. In the amended complaint, the claims, varying from ignored emails to tax fraud, are not  
10 related to one another. Identity theft, unread emails, tax fraud, changed emergency contacts, and  
11 mail fraud are not related predicate acts that would indicate conduct that embraces criminal acts  
12 with a similar purpose. Since the acts are unrelated, the third element is not satisfied.

13 Accordingly, because the Plaintiff has failed to satisfy the second and third elements of  
14 Civil RICO, her claim under 18 U.S.C. § 1961 fails on the merits.

15 **3. Immunity**

16 It is likely that Plaintiff’s RICO claim is barred by the Eleventh Amendment against some  
17 of the Defendants. Plaintiff has named the State of California and the Franchise Tax Board as  
18 Defendants. Sec. Amended Compl. at 1-2. States are given sovereign immunity under the  
19 Eleventh Amendment that, when invoked, bars adjudication of a dispute in federal court. *Agua*  
20 *Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians v. Hardin*, 223 F.3d 1041, 1045 (9th Cir. 2000); *Durning v.*  
21 *Citibank, N.A.*, 950 F.2d 1419, 1422-23 (9th Cir. 1991) (federal courts are barred from deciding  
22 virtually any case where a state is a defendant by the Eleventh Amendment). The Eleventh  
23 Amendment protects States from suits brought by citizens in federal court. *Douglas v. Cal. Dep’t*  
24 *of Youth Auth.*, 271 F.3d 812, 817 (9th Cir. 2001), *amended by* 271 F.3d 910. Therefore, Plaintiff  
25 is barred “by the Eleventh Amendment from suing the State of California in federal court.” *Ass’n*  
26 *des Eleveurs de Canards et d’Oies du Quebec v. Harris*, 729 F.3d 937, 943 (9th Cir. 2013).

27 **4. Rule 8**

28 The complaint does not comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. Rule 8(a)(2) of

1 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that the complaint set forth a “short and plain  
2 statement of the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief.” Rule 8(d)(1) states that each of  
3 the Plaintiff’s allegations must be “simple, concise, and direct.” *See McHenry v. Renne*, 84 F.3d  
4 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 1996) (affirming dismissal of complaint that was “argumentative, prolix,  
5 replete with redundancy, and largely irrelevant”). Complaints that do not comply with Rule 8 are  
6 subject to dismissal regardless of whether the complaint is meritless. *McHenry*, 84 F.3d at 1179.

7 To comply with Rule 8, a complaint need not provide detailed factual allegations, but it is  
8 “a plaintiff’s obligation to provide the grounds of his entitle[ment] to relief.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S.  
9 at 555 (internal citations and quotations omitted). A plaintiff must do more than assert “labels and  
10 conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Id.*  
11 Rather, the plaintiff must provide sufficient factual allegations “to state a claim to relief that is  
12 plausible on its face.” *Id.* at 570; *see also Coleman v. Beard*, 2015 WL 395662, at \*4 (N.D. Cal.  
13 Jan. 29, 2015) (“While the federal rules require brevity in pleading, a complaint nevertheless must  
14 be sufficient to give the defendants ‘fair notice’ of the claim and the ‘grounds upon which it  
15 rests.’”) (quoting *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007)).

16 Here, Plaintiff makes many allegations that have no facts attached, and many of the  
17 allegations are conclusory. Sec. Amended Compl. at 3-6. This is true for the discrimination,  
18 identity theft, tax fraud, mail fraud, and mail theft allegations, where Plaintiff alleges the conduct  
19 occurred without factual support. Plaintiff claims that her work was stolen by Contra Costa  
20 College and provides “Russia Correlation” to support the claim, a conclusory statement that fails  
21 to provide facts that makes the claim plausible. Sec. Amended Compl. at 4. Additionally, the  
22 claims against Meta and WCCUSD are listed simply as “Discrimination,” “Personal Injury,” and  
23 “Discrimination and harassment – Personal and Financial Injury,” with no facts or any  
24 clarification of what the discriminatory conduct or injury was that Plaintiff suffered. *Id.* at 5.  
25 Plaintiff’s providing no facts or information beyond “Discrimination” or “Discrimination and  
26 harassment” is conclusory and insufficient to make the claims against WCCUSD and Meta  
27 plausible. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570. Altogether, the Plaintiff’s second amended complaint has  
28 failed to provide sufficient factual allegations that take the claim from conceivable to plausible.

1 Thus, to comply with Rule 8's pleading requirement, Plaintiff must amend the complaint to allege:  
2 (1) the specific laws or rights that you think the defendant(s) violated; (2) for each law or right,  
3 state the specific factual allegations that connect each defendant with the alleged wrongdoing,  
4 including dates, the names of people involved, and what those people did to you; and (3) how you  
5 were harmed.

6       **5.      Rule 9**

7       When alleging a claim regarding fraud, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b) states that "a  
8 party must state with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or mistake." Fraud is  
9 properly plead by "specifically alleging fraud, or by alleging facts that necessarily constitute fraud  
10 (even if the word 'fraud' is not used)." *Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA*, 317 F.3d 1097, 1105 (9th  
11 Cir. 2003). To comply with Rule 9(b), the fraud allegations must be "specific enough to give  
12 defendants notice of the particular misconduct which is alleged to constitute the fraud charged so  
13 that they can defend against the charge and not just deny that they have done anything wrong."  
14 *Bly-Magee v. California*, 236 F.3d 1014, 1019 (9th Cir. 2001) (quoting *Neubronner v. Milken*, 6  
15 F.3d 666, 672 (9th Cir.1993)). This serves to give defendants specific notice and "deter the filing  
16 of complaints as a pretext for discovery of unknown wrongs, to protect [defendants] from the harm  
17 that comes from being subject to fraud charges, and to prohibit plaintiffs from unilaterally  
18 imposing upon the court" and society the social and economic costs absent a factual basis. *Bly-*  
19 *Magee*, 236 F.3d at 1018 (quoting *In re Stac Elec. Sec. Litig.*, 89 F.3d 1399, 1405 (9th Cir. 1996)).

20       In the second amended complaint, the Plaintiff alleges both tax fraud and mail fraud. The  
21 claim of tax fraud is made with no clear Defendant and no facts to establish conduct that would  
22 support a fraud claim. Sec. Amended Compl. at 3. The mail fraud against USPS states only that  
23 the mail was rerouted and that important notices have been missed. *Id.* at 6. These two claims are  
24 vague and only allege fraud with no further explanation. It is not clear what particular misconduct  
25 makes these claims fraud or the Defendants the conduct is attached to. *Bly-Magee*, 236 F.3d 1014,  
26 1019. Thus, the facts that the Plaintiff has provided regarding these two fraud claims are  
27 insufficient to particularly describe the circumstances that constitute fraud.

1           6.       **Rule 20**

2           The Plaintiff has listed over 20 Defendants in the second amended complaint. These  
3 parties, however, are not properly joined under the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20. Through  
4 Rule 20(a)(2), Defendants can be joined when: (A) the right to relief is asserted against them  
5 “jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction,  
6 occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences; and (B) any question of law or fact common  
7 to all defendants will arise in the action.” The same transaction requirement of the first prong  
8 refers to the “similarity in the factual background of the claim.” *Coughlin v. Rogers*, 130 F.3d  
9 1348, 1350 (9th Cir. 1997). There must be a “systematic pattern of events” that the claims arise  
10 from for them to “arise from the same transaction or occurrence.” *Id.* Here, the Plaintiff alleges  
11 different legal claims for multiple Defendants, many of which are unrelated to each other. Sec.  
12 Amended Compl. at 5-6. There are a variety of claims made against the Defendants, ranging from  
13 falsified medical records to discrimination and tax fraud, that appear to arise out of separate  
14 conduct. *Id.* at 5. Plaintiff fails to allege a series of transactions or common questions of law or  
15 fact that tie the Defendants together. Even though Plaintiff brings all claims under 18 U.S.C.  
16 1961, “the mere fact that all Plaintiff[’s] claims arise under the same general law does not  
17 necessarily establish a common question of law or fact.” *Coughlin*, 130 F.3d at 1351. The  
18 Defendants listed in the complaint are not alleged to be engaging in organized acts against  
19 Plaintiff under 18 U.S.C. 1961. Sec. Amended Compl. at 5. While the conduct is alleged under  
20 the same law, the conduct of Defendants appears to be separate from one another. *Id.* The  
21 complaint fails to provide any facts that demonstrate the Defendants were engaged in a systematic  
22 pattern of events that link them together. Thus, the second amended complaint fails to properly  
23 join the Defendants under Rule 20.

24           IV. CONCLUSION

25           For the reasons above, the Court finds Plaintiff’s amended complaint fails to state a claim  
26 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). However, given the pro se status of Plaintiff, and because it is  
27 not clear that the deficiencies of the complaint could not be cured by amendment, the Court shall  
28 grant another opportunity to amend. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to file a third

1 amended complaint by October 3, 2024.

2 **A. REQUIREMENTS FOR AMENDED COMPLAINT**

3 Because an amended complaint replaces the previous complaint, it may not incorporate  
4 claims or allegations in the original complaint by reference. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d  
5 1258, 1262 (9th Cir. 1992). Instead, any amendment must include all of the facts and claims to be  
6 presented and all of the defendants that are to be sued. In addition, any amended complaint must  
7 include the following sections:

8 **Caption Page**

9 On the first page, list the names of the defendant(s), the case number  
10 used in this order (24-cv-01280-TSH), the title (“THIRD AMENDED  
COMPLAINT”), and write “Demand for Jury Trial” if you want your  
case to be heard by a jury.

11 **Form of Pleadings**

12 The factual allegations and claims must be written in numbered  
13 paragraphs, each limited as far as practicable to a single set of  
circumstances.

14 **Subject Matter Jurisdiction**

15 The first numbered paragraph in your complaint (labeled  
16 “Jurisdiction”) should explain why this Court has the power to decide  
this kind of case. A federal court can hear a case based on a federal  
question jurisdiction (a violation of federal law under 28 U.S.C. §  
17 1331) or diversity jurisdiction (when all plaintiffs and all defendants  
are citizens of different states disputing more than \$75,000) under 28  
U.S.C. § 1332.

18 **Parties**

19 In separate paragraphs for each party, identify the plaintiff(s) and  
defendant(s) in the case.

20 **Statement of Facts**

21 Explain the important facts in your case in numbered paragraphs,  
22 describing how the defendant(s) violated the law and how you have  
been injured.

23 **Claims**

24 Include a separate heading for each legal claim (Claim 1, Claim 2,  
etc.), identifying the specific law that you think the defendant(s)  
violated and explaining in numbered paragraphs what each defendant  
did to violate each law.

25 **B. RESOURCES**

26 Plaintiff is again advised of the resources offered at the Legal Help Center, a free service  
offered by the Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco. You may

1 request an appointment by emailing [fedpro@sfbar.org](mailto:fedpro@sfbar.org) or calling 415-782-8982. At the Legal  
2 Help Center, you will be able to speak with an attorney who may be able to provide basic legal  
3 help but not representation. More information is available at [https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/pro-se-litigants/](https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/pro-<br/>4 se-litigants/).

5 Plaintiff may also wish to obtain a copy of this District's *Handbook for Litigants Without a  
6 Lawyer*, which provides instructions on how to proceed at every stage of your case. The  
7 handbook is available in person at the Clerk's Office and online at:  
8 <https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/pro-se-litigants/>.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10  
11 Dated: September 5, 2024

12   
13 THOMAS S. HIXSON  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28